

REMARKS

Claims 1-63 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-63 have been rejected. No claims have been allowed. Claims 1, 23, 37, 54 and 63 have been amended herein. No claims have been canceled. No new claims have been added.

The Office Action mailed August 3, 2007 has been carefully considered by Applicants. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing claim amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Interview Summary

Examiners Hall and Hotaling are hereby acknowledged and thanked for the courtesy extended during the personal interview on September 24, 2007, at the United States Patent and Trademark Office, between the Examiners, Keith Moore, Craig Paulsen and the undersigned attorney. The pending claims, current Office Action and prior art were all discussed during this personal interview, with particular focus on claim 1 and that which is clearly taught by the primary prior art references of record. Agreement was not reached with respect to the patentability of the pending claims, and it was suggested that clarifying amendments be made to the claims, which clarifying amendments have been made to various independent claims herein.

II. Drawing and Specification Objections

The drawings are objected to because the drawing size is too large to fit an 8-1/2" x 11" sheet of paper. The disclosure is objected to for similar reasons, as well as for noted trademark purposes and the need to update recited reference statuses. Appropriate corrections are required.

Applicants note that the present drawings and specification were filed electronically back when the electronic filing of new applications was first made available. It is believed that all

required electronic filing steps and guidelines of this time were followed, and that the specification and drawings as originally filed should have been accepted without incident.

Still, Applicants submit herewith replacement drawings and a substitute specification in response to the pending objections. These submissions are effective duplicates of what was originally filed, such that no new matter is being introduced thereby. Amendments within the substitute specification have been marked to account for the trademark and recited reference status issues. The pending objections are believed to have been obviated thereby.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 15-18, 23-27, 32-35, 37-40, 45-48, 50-54 and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0139190 to Steelberg (“Steelberg”). Applicants respectfully traverse these pending § 102(e) rejections, and submit that these rejections have been overcome in any event through the present amendments.

The present invention is generally directed toward the verification of appropriate players for the play of wager-based games at remote gaming terminals. The claimed systems and methods generally involve the use of a first communication device that provides wager-based gaming events at the remote gaming terminal via a first mode of communication, and a second communication device that obtains personal verifying information regarding the specific player at the remote gaming terminal via a separate second mode of communication *immediately before and/or during the gaming session*. Steelberg does not teach such a second mode of player verification that occurs immediately before and/or during the gaming session.

As such, each of independent claims 1, 23, 37, 54 have been amended to more clearly articulate that the claimed systems and methods require this particular timing for the player verification communication along the second mode of communication. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending § 102 rejections have been overcome thereby.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 8-14, 19-22, 28-31, 36, 41-44, 49, 55-60 and 62-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steelberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,264,557 to Schneier (“Schneier”). In particular, the Office Action states that Schneier teaches that “an updated visual image of the specific player is obtained . . . [by] scanning of the image of a player’s fingerprint.” The Office Action also states that Schneier teaches “one or more visual images of the specific player . . . taken by a camera built into the cellular phone.” Applicants respectfully traverse these pending § 103(a) rejections.

Various pending claims specify that the personal information of a player for verification purposes is a visual image of the player. Such claims include, for example, claims 11, 19, 30, 36, 43 and 58, among others. The Office Action asserts that a fingerprint of the player qualifies as such a visual image. Applicants strongly disagree that a fingerprint of a player constitutes a visual image of that player. Given the pending specification as filed and its description of visual pictures or video of a person, one of skill in the art would not understand that such a “visual image” of a player can be a mere fingerprint of the player. Such a visual image is more than just a simple fingerprint. Accordingly, the § 103 rejections of all claims requiring the visual image of a player fail for at least this reason.

Furthermore, various pending claims specifically require that such visual images of the player be taken by a camera built into a cellular phone. Such claims include, for example, dependent claims 20, 36 and 49. Neither Steelberg nor Schneier discloses such visual images of a player being taken by a cellular phone, and one of skill in the art would not read the referenced passages of Schneier as teaching visual images taken by a cellular phone. In short, the rejections of at least these claims are simply inappropriate. Accordingly, the § 103 rejections of at least claims 20, 36 and 49 fail for at least this additional reason. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of at least these claims.

Nevertheless, in the interests of furthering prosecution, Applicants have amended each of the pending independent claims to more clearly articulate that which is being claimed in light of the prior art of record. Each of independent claims 1, 23, 37, 54 has been amended as noted above. In addition, independent claim 63 has been amended to specify, “said visual image include[es] at least the face of body of said specific player.” Applicants respectfully submit that these claim amendments merely clarify what was already claimed, such that the scope of the pending claims has not been reduced thereby. Applicants also note that the rejections of at least original dependent claims 20, 36 and 49 are clearly improper, and respectfully reserve the right to pursue these original claims, and any other original claims, in this or a continuing application.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in proper form and condition for patentability, and thus request a Notification of Allowance to that effect. Consideration for a one-month extension of time petition is being submitted herewith. Should such consideration be inadvertently omitted, and/or should any other fee be required for any reason related to this document, then the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0388, referencing Docket No. IGT1P105. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below with any questions or concerns relating to this document or application.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

Date: December 3, 2007

/justinwhite/
Justin A. White, Esq.
Registration No. 48,883

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001